



Systemic Corruption and Constitutional Overreach in the American Legal System | Article 26

2025

The Unlawful Monopoly: How the Bar Seized Justice and Called it Law

Publius Custos

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.usgac.com/>

Part of the [*Operation Firewall*](#)

Recommended Citation

Publius Custos, *The Unlawful Monopoly: How the Bar Seized Justice and Called it Law*, Gov't Accountability Comm'n L. Rev. Art. 26 (2025).

Available at: <https://www.usgac.com/>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Government Accountability Commission Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in the *GAC Law Review* as part of *Operation Firewall* by the editorial board of the Commission.

1.0 Introduction: The Usurpation of Law and the Case for Abolition

The structure of the modern legal profession dominated by private guilds known as bar associations and led nationally by the American Bar Association (ABA) embodies a systemic usurpation of constitutional authority. These organizations no longer serve as impartial guardians of justice but as monopolistic gatekeepers, praetorian guards who control legal education, professional licensing, and financial access to the courts. In doing so, they have converted public trust into a private franchise.

The central claim of this report is direct, the bar's institutional framework represents an undelegated and therefore illegitimate exercise of sovereign power an organized fraud upon the people void from its inception and lawfully subject to abolition.

This deception begins with the redefinition of law itself. Where law was once understood as the discovery of immutable principles grounded in reason and divine order, the guild has replaced it with mutable rules, shifting precedents, and internal policy manuals. By this substitution, the bar has turned justice into commerce, selling access to rights that are supposed to be inherent. Luke 11:52 speaks plainly to this condition: *"Woe to you lawyers! For you have taken away the key of knowledge; you yourselves did not enter, and those who were entering you hindered."*

Far from concealing the key, the bar has seized it, fortifying its monopoly through self-authored edicts that obstruct the people's access to justice. What was intended to be a republican system of open courts and free counsel has become a closed market, governed by those who profit from complexity.

This report dismantles the bar's power structure through its three interdependent pillars:

1. Intellectual capture through legal education;
2. Illegitimate licensing that converts natural rights into guild privileges; and
3. Financial extortion that sustains the monopoly through dues and unappropriated public funds.

1.1 The Firewall: Eleven Immutable Principles of American Law of Governance

Each pillar is examined against the Firewall the Eleven Immutable Principles of American Law of Governance. These principles form the unbreakable Firewall. They are self-evident, rooted in the unbreakable hierarchy of law, the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God above all; then fundamental maxims; then constitutions; and only thereafter subordinate enactments, and self-executing. Any deviation voids acts, offices, and fruits thereof.

1. The Law of Nature is Supreme, Immutable, and Fixed

The law of nature, coeval with mankind and dictated by God Himself, reigns eternally over every human institution. No act, statute, or decree can override what God has ordained. As Blackstone declared, it is "superior in obligation to any other." The Law of God cannot be degraded, amended, or voided— *"Whatever I command thee, ye shall not add to nor take away from it"* (Deut. 12:32). Things forbidden by the nature of things are

confirmed by no law. When government defies this, it stands void. *Branch, Prine*. Reason is the life of the law—*Coke*. This is not theory. This is the first brick.

- a. **True Law follows the following hierarchy: nature, maxims, constitutions, enactments.**
- b. **Law of revelation – God's law – first, unchangeable.** Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*: "The divine law is of infinite authority... the moral precepts which God has given to mankind."
- c. **Fundamental Maxims of law – eternal, self-evident, beyond proof or discourse.** Coke, *Institutes of the Laws of England* (1628), Id. 67a: "Propositions to be of all men confessed and granted without prooffe, argument, or discourse... they are not to be disputed: they are the law of the land."
- d. **Constitutions of society – man's written cage for government, only if they kneel to revelation and maxims.** Cooley, *Constitutional Limitations* (1868): "No enactment can rise above the constitution; but the constitution itself must bow to the higher law."
- e. **Enactments – statutes, codes, rules.** Cooley: "Enactments are not the law of the land, they are but the will of the legislature, subject always to the maxims and to reason."

2. All Rights Are God-Given, Unalienable, and Pre-Political

We hold these truths to be self-evident: all men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. These rights pre-exist with any government. They are declared, not granted. They are untouchable by statute, border, or emergency. "*The law is a rule of right; and whatever is contrary to the rule of right, is an injury*" (Vanhorne v. Dorrance). "*Individual liberties are antecedent to all government.*" (C.L.M.). Blackstone affirms: these rights cannot be surrendered. They are safeguarded by declaratory and restrictive clauses in every state constitution. No human law can override what God ordained.

3. The Sole and Only Legitimate End of Government Is to Protect Life, Liberty, and Property

Government exists for one purpose, to secure the citizen in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property. When it assumes any other function, it is usurpation and oppression. The Alabama Constitution declares it plainly. Massachusetts echoes: government is for the common good, not the profit of any man, family, or class. When government betrays this purpose, it forfeits legitimacy. (Second Treatise, §135) It invites people's corrections. Anything else is tyranny.

4. Government Derives Its Sole Authority from The Explicit, Expressed Delegation of the People. Any Power Beyond That Is Usurpation, Pure Treason Against the People's Sovereignty.

Five immutable rules govern this grant:

- a. Only what the people possess can be granted (*Shep. Touch*. 243).
- b. Delegated power cannot be redelegated (*2 Inst*. 597).
- c. Derivative power cannot exceed the original (*Noy, Max*.).
- d. Power not expressly granted has no authority (*Black's, 2d*. 1181).

- e. Presumptions, adhesion contracts, and implied consent are void.

Madison warned: federal powers are “few and defined” (*Federalist 45*). Paine: all delegated power is trust; all assumed power is usurpation. Tucker: every act beyond constitutional limits is treason against the people’s sovereignty. There is no middle ground.

5. **Every public official is bound by an oath to uphold and defend the constitutions, any breach, maladministration, usurpation, or betrayal forfeits their office instantly.**
 - a. **Oaths bind absolutely.** *Tucker, Blackstone’s Commentaries (Vol. 1, App. Note B, §3, 1803): “If... public functionaries exceed the limits... every act is an act of usurpation, and as such, treason against the sovereignty of the People.”*
 - b. Maxim: *“It is immaterial whether a man gives his assent by words or by acts and deeds.”* (10 Coke, 52) – Actions contrary to the oath are betrayal. When officials break this sacred bond, they do not merely err, they rebel against the People’s trust. Their authority vanishes the moment the oath is broken.
6. **When Government Acts Beyond Its Legitimate Powers or Becomes Oppressive, It Is the Right and Duty of The People to Resist, Reform, Or Abolish It, Restoring A Government to Its True Purpose.**
 - a. *“Whenever the ends of Government are perverted, and public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the People may, and of right ought, to reform the old, or establish a new Government...”* (Maryland Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 6)
 - b. *“Who shall be judge, whether the prince or legislative act contrary to their trust? ... The people shall be judge...”* (John Locke, *Second Treatise*, § 240)
 - c. *“Whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it...”* (Declaration of Independence)
7. **The Power to Indict and Convict Resides Solely with The People, Through Grand Juries to Accuse and Petit Juries to Judge, Free from Control by Judges or Government Officials.**
 - a. *John Adams (1779): “The grand jury is a security to the subject against unfounded accusation; it is a check upon the government, not a servant of it.”* (Massachusetts Historical Society, *Adams Papers*)
 - b. *“The grand jury is a security against hasty and oppressive prosecutions... it is the people’s protection against the abuse of power.”* (Alexander Hamilton, *Federalist No. 83*)
 - c. *“No free man shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property but by the lawful judgment of his peers...”* (Magna Carta, Ch. 39)
 - d. Justice Scalia: *“The Fifth Amendment creates a fourth branch, the jury, outside the government.”* (*Blakely v. Washington*, 542 U.S. 296, 2004)
 - e. Maxim: *“Nemo accusatur nisi per judicium parium suorum”* No one is accused except by the judgment of their peers.

8. The Judiciary's Sole Duty Is to Declare the Law as Written, Aligned with The Law of Nature, Fundamental Principles, And the Constitution; Any Reinterpretation or Creation of Law Violates Their Oath and Usurps Power.

- a. *"The judiciary must apply the law as it stands, not extend its reach beyond the trust reposed in it, lest it encroach upon liberty."* (John Locke, *Second Treatise*, § 136)
- b. *"The judiciary power ought not to be united with the legislative... lest the same judge make and apply laws, becoming a tyrant."* (Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws*)
- c. *"In that sense alone [original meaning], it is the legitimate Constitution... If that be not the guide, there can be no security for a consistent and stable government."* (James Madison, *Letter to Henry Lee*, 1824)
- d. *"A court can only declare what the law is, and whether consistent with the law of god, and the fundamental or constitutional law of society."* (*The State v. Post*, 20 N.J.L. 368, 370, 1845)

9. The Republican Form of Government Is Guaranteed and Flows from The Unbreakable Hierarchy: Law of God, Fundamental Law, Constitution. It Is Rule of Law, Not Rule of Men.

- a. *"In republics, the great danger is, that the majority may not sufficiently respect the rights of the minority... The law is the rule, and it is immutable."* (Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws*)
- b. *"Let us disappoint the Men who are raising themselves upon the ruin of this Country."* (John Adams, *Letter to Abigail Adams*, 1776)
- c. *"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government..."* (U.S. Constitution, Art. IV, § 4)
- d. *"The fundamental maxims of a free government... are so simple and so important, that they are taken for granted without proof."* (James Wilson, *Lectures on Law*, 1791)
- e. Maxim: *"Lex non scripta, lex naturalis"*, *The unwritten law is the natural law, binding above all statutes.*
- f. *"The people have a right, in an orderly and peaceable manner, to assemble to consult upon the common good; give instructions to their representatives..."* (*Massachusetts Constitution, Part the First, Art. XIX*)
- g. *"Where the people in due form give notice to their magistrates, such notice standeth in law as if the King himself had commanded it."* Edward Coke, *The Institutes of the Laws of England*, Book III, Ch. V.
- h. *"One lawfully commanding must be obeyed."* Schenken's Maxim 120

10. When Those Entrusted with Authority Breach This Firewall, Their Office Is Dissolved. This Clause Is Self-Executing and Requires No Legislation to Make It Effectual.

- a. *"for rebellion being an opposition, not to persons, but authority, which is founded only in the constitutions and laws of the government; those, whoever they be, who by force break through, and by force justify their violation of them, are truly and properly rebels: for when men, by entering into society and civil government,*

have excluded force, and introduced laws for the preservation of property, peace, and unity amongst themselves; those who set up force again in opposition to the laws, do rebellare, that is, bring back again the state of war, and are properly rebels;” (John Locke, Second Treatise, § 226) True rebellion is not the people’s resistance to tyranny, it is the betrayal of public officers who violate their oath.

- b. *The Fourteenth Amendment, Section 3 declares: “No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof.”*
- c. *“This clause is self-executing and requires no legislation to make it effectual.” (Senator James Grimes, Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess. 2544, 1866)*
- d. *“Whosoever by either ambition, fear, folly or corruption, endeavor to grasp themselves, or put into the hands of any other, an absolute power over the lives, liberties, and estates of the people; by this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people out into their hands for quite contrary ends, and devolves to the people, who have a right to resume their original liberty, and by the establishment of a new legislative, (such as they shall think fit) provide for their own safety and security, which is the end for which they are in society (John Locke, Second Treatise, § 222)*
- e. *“When legislators or rulers... endeavor to take away and destroy the property of the people, or reduce them to slavery under arbitrary power, they put themselves into a state of war with the people, who are thereupon absolved from any further obedience.” (John Locke, Second Treatise, § 227)*

When officers betray their oath, they are the rebels, disqualified instantly by the Fourteenth Amendment’s own force. The people, acting in orderly assembly, command their removal and the restoration of a republican government. This is not request; it is law.

11. These Immutable Principles Are Supreme, No Exception. The Law Is Clear, The Only Way Through the Firewall Is Process of Law, Sanctioned by The Maxims.

The Constitution stands as an expression of immutable principles, truths rooted in the Law of Nature, divine authority, and the sovereign will of the People. These truths are eternal, fixed, and absolute. They are not subject to debate, interpretation, or convenience. No government, no judge, and no emergency can alter or override them. As John Adams declared, “A constitution is not a contract to be broken, but a covenant to be kept.” They are not opinions. They are not negotiable. They are, above all, the law. Any act contrary to them is not law at all but rebellion against the very foundation of liberty.

Sir Edward Coke affirmed that maxims hold “*chiefest dignity and most certain authority, and because they are universally approved by all.*” A maxim is a universal principle of law, so self-evident it is confessed and granted “*without prooffe, argument, or discourse.*”

To disregard immutable maxims is to invite deception, usurpation, and government encroachment, for without them there is no fixed compass of right and wrong. When officials twist the Constitution as opinion or treat it as optional, they abandon covenants for tyranny, trading law for arbitrary power.

The only way through the firewall is the lawful process of law that is due. Due process is not defined by statute, code, policy, regulation, or the will of man. Due process, synonymous with the law of the land and the common law, is sanctioned by the ancient maxims of wisdom. *“Due process of law in each particular case means such an exercise of the powers of government as the settled maxims of law permit and sanction, and under the safeguards for the protection of individual rights as those maxims prescribe for the class of cases to which the one in question belongs.”* – Cooley, Constitutional Limitations (1868), p. 356.

Any deviation from that order constitutes rebellion against lawful government. Under Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment, officials who swear to uphold the Constitution but operate outside this hierarchy are disqualified ipso facto, no additional process required. *“This clause is self-executing and requires no legislation to make it effectual.”* (Senator James Grimes, Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess. 2544, 1866)

The urgency of reform is underscored by the present legal climate. Federal scrutiny of bar associations for misuse of funds and discriminatory practices has exposed deep structural weakness. Yet beyond contemporary controversy lies a timeless imperative, to restore lawful order grounded not in policy or preference, but in the immutable law itself. The Firewall Principles provide that restoration pathway an operational charter for re-establishing a true republic of laws, not men.

2.0 The Foundational Deception, Redefining “Law” to Serve the Guild

At the heart of the bar’s monopoly lies its foundational deception, redefining the very meaning of law. True Law is not a creation of men but a discovery of reason. It is fixed, unchanging, and binding upon all people and institutions alike superior to the will of any ruler, legislature, or court. Blackstone wrote that *“the law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is superior in obligation to any other.”* Coke called these precepts “ancient truths beyond proof or discourse,” while Cooley affirmed that *“an enactment is not the law of the land; it is subordinate to constitutional and natural limits.”* Hamilton tackled the consequence, *“the judiciary has no influence over either the sword or the purse... will always be, beyond compare, the least dangerous branch-only because it's locked to law it didn't write.”* These authorities reveal the authentic hierarchy, God's law above maxims, maxims above constitutions, constitutions above statutes.

“The people license the law, not guilds.” – Coke, 10 Co. Rep. 110b

The bar’s redefinition of “law” replaces this eternal structure with a humanist construct law as the will of judges, a fluid system of precedent and procedure, enabling lawyers and judges to legislate from the bench while pretending to interpret. Reducing what was once the people’s

inheritance of immutable truth, into mere administrative preference. Power and ability never delegated to the judicial branch and a direct violation of separation of powers. Massachusetts Constitution, Part the First, Article XXX declares, *“In the government of this commonwealth, the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them: the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them: the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them: to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men.”*

Blackstone stated the role of a judge is not to innovate or create new law, but to declare what the law is—as it stands in alignment with the eternal principles of natural justice. This duty is not discretionary; it is mandatory. Judges are the mouth of the law, speaking what reason and custom have already ordained, not the stomach that digests it into novel forms. This truth was further declared in *The State v. Post*, 20 N.J.L. 368, 370 (1845), *“A court can only declare what the law is, and whether consistent with the law of God, and the fundamental or constitutional law of society.”*

Law students are trained to memorize precedents rather than understand principles. Graduates emerge as technicians of compliance rather than guardians of truth. Precedent has become their scripture, procedure, their liturgy, and conformity their creed.

Nowhere is this substitution clearer than in the Massachusetts Guide to Evidence, prepared under the direction of the Supreme Judicial Court but largely authored by bar committees. The Guide proclaims itself a “predictive” statement of the law of evidence not binding yet treated as binding in every court. By presenting “common law” as something that can develop or evolve, the Guide rejects the immutability that defines the common law itself.

Coke held that the common law consists of immemorial maxims sanctioned by reason and time, not innovations of policy. When courts declare new “developments” in law, they cease to declare and begin to create crossing from judgment into legislation. As Justice Gorsuch recently warned, *“When judges declare not what the law is, but what they wish it to be, the idea of government by the people is placed in peril.”*

Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas said the high court shouldn't blindly follow precedents to guide rulings if the established rulings go against what the law says or doesn't line up with the nation's legal traditions. *“At some point we need to think about what we're doing with stare decisis,”* Thomas said Thursday while speaking at an event at the Catholic University of America Columbus School of Law in Washington, D.C. *“And it's not some sort of talismanic deal where you can just say 'stare decisis' and not think, turn off the brain, right?” “We never go to the front to see who's driving the train, where is it going. And you could go up there in the engine room, find it's an orangutan driving the train, but you want to follow that just because it's a train,”* Thomas said. *“I don't think that I have the gospel,”* he said, *“that any of these cases that have been decided are the gospel, and I do give perspective to the precedent. But it should,*

the precedent should be respectful of our legal tradition, and our country, and our laws, and be based on something, not just something somebody dreamt up and others went along with."

The Guide's hearsay provisions specifically Rule 803 permit judges to admit what no jury ever confronts, excited utterances, business records, and second-hand statements offered in place of sworn testimony. Such evidence escapes cross-examination, eludes confrontation, and denies the accused the fundamental right to test it "face to face." The Guide deems these fragments "*reliable enough*." Yet Blackstone drew this line with unmistakable clarity, reliability is the province of peers, not of robes. "*A verdict imports the concurrence of all the jurors; they are the ones who smell the lie*." (4 Comm. 303.)

- Magna Carta expressed the same command; no man shall be deprived but by the judgment of his peers.
- The Massachusetts Constitution, Part I, Article XII, requires that every accused shall meet the witnesses face to face.
- The Sixth Amendment affirms this guarantee. These are not suggestions, they are mandates.

When the Guide expands hearsay, judicial discretion lets us add exceptions, it quietly asserts that one man may override twelve. That is not development; it is demolition. Juries are the judges of both fact and law, that's not precedent, that's the axiom the Founders left us. Blackstone, "*the verdict imports concurrence of all the jurors*", they decide credibility, not the robe, "*for the majority to be absolutely bound by the opinions and determination of a few, would be little short of tyranny*" (4 Blackstone's Commentaries 303). Coke, "*The jury... are the lamps that shew every man at his door, and every man ought to know what the law is, for the law is in every man's hands*." (Paraphrased from his commentary on Magna Carta, Second Institute, page 482)

So, if a mother says, he hit me, off-stage, and the judge swallows it as an excited utterance, the twelve get robbed-no cross, no discovery, no vote. The Guide didn't evolve evidence; it buried the jury under polite footnotes. One man deciding reliability? That's the opposite of the system. Vattel, Law of Nations, Book I, Chapter III, Section 34, "*The constitution of the state ought to possess stability... and since that was first established by the nation, which afterwards entrusted certain persons with the legislative power, the fundamental laws, such as judgment by peers, are exempted from their commission*." The legislature, delegated only to enact, holds no lawful power to replace peers with policy. How, then, can the court? It can't. The bar does. Through authorship of the Guide, through committee control, through silent infiltration of judicial thought, the bar achieves what no branch was ever delegated to do, an inversion of sovereignty. And Section 30, "*To attack the constitution of the state, to violate its laws*", whether by rewriting its judgments, benching juries, or calling exemption progress, "*is a capital crime against society; and if those entrusted with authority are guilty, they add to this crime a perfidious abuse of power with which they are entrusted*." The bar has merely accomplished this inversion in slow motion.

2.1 Discrepancies in the Massachusetts Guide to Evidence

To highlight the contradictions, I've refined the table to explicitly demonstrate how the Guide's provisions, particularly its "predictive" and expandable approach, deviate from immutable common law maxims and constitutional mandates. The focus on hearsay emphasizes the subversion of "judgment of peers", the Guide's judicial discretion allows untested statements to bypass jury confrontation, effectively substituting one judge's determination for the collective verdict of twelve, in violation of foundational guarantees of due process and trial by jury. This is not evolution but an unauthorized override, as the legislature itself lacks power to alter such fundamentals (per Vattel, §34), let alone the judiciary through "development."

Massachusetts Guide to Evidence (2025)	Immutable Common Law Principles	Constitutional Foundation
Treats evidence law as "predictive" and capable of development through judicial practice and case-by-case expansion (Intro. Note to §801; see also §803 commentary allowing ongoing refinement of exceptions).	Law is declaratory, not creative or evolutionary; courts must declare existing maxims, not innovate through discretion or "development." Coke: "Reason is the life of the law... and the common law itself is nothing else but reason" (2 Inst. 156), fixed by time and custom, beyond judicial whim.	Mass. Const. Pt. I, Art. XXX: The judiciary shall never exercise legislative power; "developments" through case law constitute unauthorized enactment, rendering the Guide's predictive model void as ultra vires.
Expands hearsay exceptions through judicial discretion (e.g., §803(1)–(2): present sense impression and excited utterance admit out-of-court statements without cross-examination or jury weighing of reliability; commentary notes these "evolve" via precedent).	Reliability of evidence, including hearsay, must be tested by the "judgment of his peers", the jury's collective assessment, not a single judge's fiat. Magna Carta ch. 39, "No man shall be deprived... but by the judgment of his peers and the law of the land." Blackstone: "A verdict imports in law a concurrence of all the jurors" (4 Comm. 303), they, not the robe, decide credibility through confrontation.	Mass. Const. Pt. I, Art. XII: Every subject has a right "to meet the witnesses against him face to face" and be judged by "his peers"; U.S. Const. Amend. V (due process as "settled maxims of law," per Cooley) and Amend. VI (Confrontation Clause). Judicial "expansion" overrides peers, substituting one man's discretion for twelve, a direct subversion of jury sovereignty (Firewall Principle 7).
Cites appellate precedent as primary authority for admissibility and interpretation (e.g., §801–804 commentary relies on case law to "predict" application, treating prior rulings as evolving norms).	Precedent is advisory only, a memorandum of prior alignments; true law derives from divine reason, natural justice, and immemorial maxims, not judicial accretion. Coke: Settled maxims are "beyond proof or discourse" (8	Firewall Principle 8: Courts declare law aligned with God, fundamental maxims, and constitutions, precedent yields if repugnant; Mass. Const. Pt. 1, Art. XXX forbids judicial legislation via "predictive" precedent, as it encroaches on

**Massachusetts Guide to
Evidence (2025)**

**Immutable Common Law
Principles**

Rep. 118a), courts declare alignment, not bind future cases to past errors.

Constitutional Foundation

legislative power. Vattel §30: Such attacks on constitutional stability (e.g., elevating mutable case law over fixed maxims) constitute a capital crime against society, amplified to perfidious abuse if by entrusted officials.

The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court itself once declared the unbreakable rule: “*The same reason, the same law.*” *Charles River Bridge v. Warren Bridge*, 7 Pick. 493 (1830).

This maxim, older than the ABA by half a century, forbids judicial whim. Where the reason (the natural justice, the maxim, the constitutional mandate) is identical, the law must be identical. Yet the Guide’s “predictive” model and expanding hearsay exceptions do precisely what this Court once condemned, they treat the same confrontation violation as a “new development,” admitting untested statements under the same factual pressure (excited utterance, business record) that juries once rejected.

The reason has not changed. The right to face accusers has not evolved. The jury’s role has not been delegated away.

Same reason. Same law.

The Guide’s innovation is not progress, it is rebellion against the Court’s own precedent, and against the Firewall.

The Massachusetts Guide to Evidence is not an anomaly, it is Exhibit One in a nationwide pandemic of usurpation, where every state’s ‘modern rules’ copy the same override of jury and maxim. By redefining “common law” as a shifting body of precedent, the guild transforms a stable inheritance into a moving target. Predictability, the very essence of law is lost. Precedent that diverges from immutable principle is not law at all; procedure that obstructs the people’s right to redress is not due process.

The Firewall remains the true and final measure. It admits no amendment, no repeal, no compromise. Law schools may ignore it, bar associations may obscure it, and courts may deny it, but it endures, immovable, as the supreme expression of natural justice. To depart from it is not to evolve it is to rebel.

3.0 Education: The Factory of Obedience

3.1 The Apprenticeship Tradition

For most of human history and for every American generation until 1878 the study of law was not academic but experiential. Students apprenticed under seasoned practitioners, absorbing the craft through observation, repetition, and lived judgment. There were no syllabi, tuition fees, or examinations. The master determined when an apprentice was fit to stand in court, and the community itself decided whether that individual could be trusted to represent others.

This system rested upon three self-evident truths:

1. **Reason is not memorized; it is discovered.**

It emerges through the discipline of applying principle to circumstance, through failure, correction, and moral accountability. The apprentice of law did not absorb doctrine through lecture; he absorbed it through lived encounter with truth and falsehood, justice and abuse. He learned what it meant for evidence to breathe, for witnesses to falter, for an oath to carry weight. This was reason in motion, the slow awakening of moral discernment shaped by observation, not instruction.

In this sense, legal reasoning was never a matter of linguistic precision alone but of moral calibration. An apprentice came to see that the law cannot be understood apart from its effect, that a single procedural deviation, the admission of hearsay, the denial of a jury, the silence of an intimidated witness, reverberates beyond one case, wounding the principle itself. True reason, then, is the perception of consequence, the ability to see beyond rules into what those rules were written to prevent.

The classroom may repeat the words of justice; but only practice teaches its cost.

2. **Coke's "Artificial Reason" and the Discipline of Law**

When Sir Edward Coke spoke of "*artificial reason*," he did not mean contrivance or invention. The term *artificial* in his era denoted something *crafted by art*, the cultivated skill that transforms raw experience into structured understanding. Artificial reason was reason made perfect by study, observation, and the moral imagination of judgment.

To Coke, the common law represented centuries of refined reasoning, "the perfection of reason," not because judges were superior intellects, but because their judgments distilled the collective experience of countless men who had suffered, pleaded, and decided before them. The law was thus not born in universities but in courts, markets, and fields, where life collided with principle and revealed its limits.

Coke's artificial reason demanded humility. It required the lawyer and judge alike to conform to precedent *only insofar as precedent conformed to reason and justice*. It was the disciplined recognition that law is declaratory, not creative, that the magistrate

declares what reason and custom have already established, not what his discretion prefers.

To remove law from lived experience and place it in lecture halls is to hollow it of its art. The result is not artificial reason but artificial lawyers, technicians fluent in procedure, estranged from justice.

3. Human Nature Does Not Change

The enduring lesson of the apprenticeship system was not merely legal, but anthropological, human nature is constant. The same impulses that drove kings to dissolve parliaments drive modern administrators to bypass juries. The same pride that animated monarchs now animates bureaucracies. Every generation rediscovers tyranny under new vocabulary, progress, safety, equity, reform, but the substance remains unchanged.

For this reason, the law must be immovable where man is not. It must bind transient will to eternal rule. The apprentice learned this pattern firsthand. He saw how easily a sheriff could turn debtor into criminal by manipulating process; how swiftly a magistrate, left unchecked, could substitute discretion for law. In witnessing such cycles, he came to understand why Magna Carta forbade deprivation but by the judgment of one's peers, and why every constitution worth its ink reaffirms that the rule of law must stand above the rule of men.

Modern legal education, by contrast, teaches variability. It treats human nature as an evolving abstraction and the law as a flexible instrument. But experience proves otherwise. What was injustice in 1628 remains injustice in 2025; only the uniforms and vocabulary have changed. The bar's error lies in forgetting that to deny the constancy of human nature is to deny the very reason for having law at all.

A right violated in 1215 wounds the same in 1875. The apprentice learned to detect tyranny whether in king, sheriff, tax collector, or judge before it finished speaking.

Law speaks loudest through action, not abstraction.

Lincoln read Blackstone while splitting rails and debated Vattel with farmers. His mastery came not from memorization but from having felt the weight of every maxim.

Apprenticeship thus forged advocates who lived their oaths rather than recited them. A master's fidelity was the curriculum itself. If a judge admitted hearsay, the master walked out not into contempt (then a narrow power) but into social exile. The apprentice learned fidelity before loyalty, conscience before career.

3.2 The Founding of the American Bar Association

That civic apprenticeship ended on August 21, 1878, when seventy-five lawyers from twenty states and the District of Columbia convened in Saratoga Springs to found the American Bar Association (ABA). No clause in the United States Constitution or any state charter authorized a private guild to license a profession; yet they assumed that power.

By their first annual meeting in Chicago (1889), the Association had 158 members. The right to assemble is sacred; the right to annex authority is trespass. With that act, the apprenticeship model began to decline.

Where a student once debated Coke in a tavern and emerged grounded in both moral and constitutional law, the same student now required institutional certification. The ABA built schools, declared them “modern,” and presented them as indispensable. Accreditation was never statutory it became a mechanism of control, the cornerstone of a self-sustaining monopoly uniting education, licensing, and enforcement under one banner. The ABA's accreditation was never statutory, it was assumed. That assumption became monopoly.

3.3 The Curriculum as a Tool of Omission

The modern Juris Doctor program replaced apprenticeship with a rigid academic apparatus designed to produce compliance rather than understanding. ABA accreditation dictates course content nationwide, ensuring that natural law and constitutional history remain peripheral.

- 92 % of the curriculum concerns code and procedure.
- 8 % concerns history and that 8 % is elective.
- Fewer than 9 % of total credits touch any material predating 1789.
- Harvard Law (2025): zero required hours on natural law, twelve on civil procedure.
- 2024 Survey: only 19 % of graduates could cite Blackstone on jury sovereignty without reference.

This pattern is not incidental it is deliberate omission. The ABA's accreditation standards incentivize conformity with procedural norms at the expense of immutable principles. To begin with the First Immutable Principle that dominion rests in natural law would immediately expose the bar's licensing model as void under Principle Four, which forbids redelegation of sovereign power.

Instead, students are trained to memorize precedents without examining their fidelity to constitutional hierarchy (Principle Eight) and to internalize procedural barriers that obscure the jury's sovereignty over both fact and law (Principle Seven). As one practitioner summarized, “Constitution? Elective. Take it if you're into philosophy.”

Thus, the Massachusetts Constitution, the judiciary's explicit charter, becomes optional esoterica rather than binding command. The result is not ignorance but indoctrination, a generation of technicians of enactment, not custodians of immutable law.

3.4 Continuing Legal Education, Perpetual Reinforcement

Graduation offers no escape from indoctrination. Continuing Legal Education (CLE) requirements entrench obedience through annual recertification in guild orthodoxy. In Massachusetts, attorneys must complete twelve hours per year (G.L. c. 221, § 43A), including two on “ethics.”

A 2024 review of approved CLE providers revealed that 80–90 % of offerings concern procedural updates, compliance protocols, or administrative ethics. None address natural law, constitutional maxims, or doctrines such as void ab initio. The bar funds presenters, vets content and collects fees creating a self-reinforcing financial and intellectual loop.

Absent are Vattel’s warnings against constitutional subversion and Bastiat’s indictment of “legal plunder.” This omission is intentional: inquiry is replaced by obedience, critical thought by credentialism. Through CLE, practitioners reaffirm loyalty not to the law itself, but to the guild’s procedural orthodoxy.

3.5 The Praetorian Guard of the Guild

The pedagogical machine produces no independent defenders of rights, only a Praetorian Guard for the guild, peddling borrowed nobility to the masses. These officers of procedure now populate nearly every structural seam of civic life. By the American Bar Association’s own accounting, attorneys participate in over 70% of municipal policy deliberations nationwide. What began as professional presence has matured into pervasive control.

You find them everywhere the people’s voice once stood unmediated, in human-resources cubicles drafting dismissals, in corporate boardrooms approving waivers, in city-hall offices converting policy into legalese, and in non-profits that once relied on conscience but now require counsel before they act. They infest the margins where liberty breathes labor unions, school boards, zoning commissions, family courts, child-protective agencies anywhere a natural right might twitch, a lawyer stands pre-placed to interpret, dilute, or silence it.

Their allegiance is not to justice but to the guild’s proprietary administration, a direct violation of government’s single legitimate end, to secure rights, full stop. Within this machinery, dissent is not suppressed after it arises; it is engineered out of existence before it can begin. The system ensures that no unapproved principle survives contact with authority.

A forty-year veteran of the bar confessed the effect with candor: “Three years of motions, six of retainers I was a trained monkey until conscience slapped me.” Another, disbarred for delinquent dues, captured the culture succinctly: “School was boot camp in billing, not breathing.”

Intellectual capture is absolute. Bar loyalty outranks constitutional fidelity every time. The profession now polices itself, finances itself, and exempts itself functionally a fourth branch of government, accountable only to its due’s ledgers and internal councils. What was once the

steward of justice was supplanted by the guild's certified officer, stationed at every gate to ensure that no idea, claim, or conscience, no child with a scraped knee or citizen with a grievance passes through without a retainer.

3.6 The Scoreboard, Re-Engineering Obedience

After nearly a century and a half of bar-controlled education, the results are measurable. Accreditation and licensing have not elevated justice, they have industrialized its erosion.

- Criminal plea rate: 98 % of defendants now plead guilty without a jury trial, up from 92 % in 1980 the decade CLE became entrenched.
- Civic literacy: 78 % of new graduates cannot name the first ten amendments from memory.
- Public trust: Pro se filings have risen 25 % in the last decade, as citizens lose faith in attorneys who no longer recognize fundamental rights.
- Juries and acquittals: Jury trials decline while acquittals remain flat procedural efficiency replacing moral judgment.

Government's sole legitimate end, as Locke, Vattel, and the Declaration each affirm, is to secure life, liberty, and property not to optimize clearance rates or bureaucratic throughput. A system that trains ninety-eight percent of its practitioners to secure conviction rather than justice ceases to be lawful. It becomes an engine of oppression power repurposed to obstruct natural right.

Locke warned that betrayal of trust by those entrusted with authority constitutes rebellion, to be judged by the people. Tucker, commenting on Blackstone, concluded that treason against the state is treason against the people themselves. By that measure, the modern bar has not refined the law it has industrialized betrayal.

3.7 The Silence Where a Jury Once Stood

The apprenticeship is gone.

Reason is gone.

The oath is gone.

All that remains is the bill and the silence where a jury once stood.

The bar banned apprenticeship because a kid who felt the oath break couldn't be controlled; a kid who highlighted it could.

4.0 The Illegitimate Monopoly of Licensing

Licensing is the keystone of the bar's usurpation the mechanism by which a natural right is converted into a regulated privilege. In principle, the right to advocate justice belongs inherently to the people. In practice, it has been enclosed within a guild whose authority was never granted,

only presumed. The result is a constitutional nullity, a private syndicate exercising coercive power without delegation, operating under color of law but outside its bounds. “*The people alone license the law*”; no guild may usurp that authority. Coke, 10 Co. Rep. 110b. No provision of the Constitution, state or federal, authorizes such a transfer. The people never delegated licensing power to Congress, nor did Congress delegate it to the American Bar Association. Even if such a delegation had occurred, the maxim “*delegata potestas non potest delegari*” forbids its re-delegation to a private cartel. (Firewall Principle 4).

From 1889 forward, the bar’s licensing regime has functioned not as a safeguard of competence but as a barrier to lawful access to a citadel of exclusion wherein justice is meted out only through the approved priesthood. No provision of the Constitution, state or federal authorizes such a power. No act of Congress, no state convention, no popular referendum ever transferred to the bar the right to determine who may speak the law. The American Bar Association simply declared it. This declaration created an Article I §10 loyalty loop, Congress never delegated licensing; the ABA annexed it. The Constitution recognizes no such intermediary. The title “officer of the court” is foreign to the constitutional order; the Framers knew only “counsel” and “the people.” Dual allegiance, sworn to both Constitution and guild, constitutes perjury by design. (Firewall Principle 5).

What began as an assembly of seventy-five men at Saratoga Springs metastasized into a national monopoly an unvoted fourth branch of government reducing citizenship itself to clientship. The judiciary, staffed exclusively by bar-licensed judges, cannot remain impartial when enforcing the very rules that certified its members. Coke, Littleton 141a: “*No man shall be judge in his own cause.*” Cooley, Constitutional Limitations (8th ed., 1878), p. 323: “*No person can be a judge in his own cause... one cannot be both party and judge.*” Yet bar-licensed courts routinely enforce guild edicts, they fine pro se litigants for unauthorized practice, hold contempt hearings for bypassing licensed counsel, and treat ABA Model Rules as binding law. They also enforce rules of evidence, never legislated, never delegated, drafted by bar committees and imposed without constitutional warrant. The robe swears to the Constitution, not the bar card. The oath collides. The court becomes, in substance, the guild's internal tribunal, wielding constitutional robes for private discipline.

4.1 Oath Collision: Perjury by Design

Upon admission to practice, every attorney swears the traditional oath:

“I will support the Constitution of the United States and of this Commonwealth and will faithfully discharge the duties incumbent upon me.”

This is the first constitutional, public, and lawful oath.

Immediately thereafter, the same initiate is required to affirm implicit fidelity to the bar’s internal codes, such as Rule 1.01 or its state equivalents, which impose “*primary loyalty to the court and the profession.*” This is the second private, unrecorded, and coercively binding oath.

The two are irreconcilable. One demands allegiance to the people's charter; the other demands obedience to the guild that presumes to license allegiance itself. The result is a standing condition of perjury: two masters, one mouth, and no forum to decide which commands prevail. Dual allegiance, sworn to both Constitution and guild, constitutes perjury by design. (Firewall Principle 5).

In any other fiduciary profession, such a conflict would require disclosure. Real-estate brokers must provide agency statements identifying whether their loyalty runs to client, broker, or self. Attorneys provide no such disclosure because the conflict is structural and the profession's continued existence depends on silence. The first oath becomes ceremonial; the second, operational. Principle 5 is thus violated at inception, officers bound to uphold immutable law are induced to serve mutable policy.

4.3 Codified Conflicts of Interest

This duality is not incidental; it is codified. ABA Model Rule 1.7 formalizes the subordination of constitutional duty to guild interest. It instructs attorneys to maintain loyalty to clients "unless" that loyalty conflicts with their obligations to the court or the profession a clause that in practice nullifies the first.

In the courtroom, this produces systemic betrayal:

- a favorable precedent suppressed because a bar committee disfavors its citation;
- a jury waived because a judge discourages unpredictable outcomes;
- a plea induced to clear a docket rather than to secure justice.

Each act violates the oath to the Constitution yet fulfills the bar's internal rules. It is, in effect, perjury without the formality of perjury a continuous deflection of duty from the people to the institution.

The conflict extends to the bench. Judges, prosecutors, and defenders alike are dues-bound members of the same guild. 28 U.S.C. § 455(a)–(b)(1) mandates recusal wherever impartiality "might reasonably be questioned." Yet the bar's status as "officer of the court" unites all actors on one side of the equation. The result is a self-adjudicating monopoly in direct contravention of Coke's maxim in *The Dr. Bonham's Case* and 8 Rep. 118a: "No man shall be judge in his own cause."

The colloquy of modern justice thus runs in a closed circuit:

- Court to citizen: "You are not an attorney."
- Attorney to court: "I am an officer of the court."
- Citizen to both: unheard, unsworn, and thus unrepresented.

4.3 Criminalizing Justice with UPL Statutes

The bar fortifies its monopoly through Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL) statutes instruments that criminalize the very exercise of natural right. These laws convert neighborly aid, family advocacy, or lay representation into penal offenses.

The irony is historic. Before 1889, no such prohibitions existed. Lincoln drafted pleadings for farmers without fee. Blackstone published Commentaries to instruct the laity in their own rights. Coke lectured publicly in the Inns of Court, which were open forums for citizens as well as students. The right to speak the law was as inherent as the right to petition.

Today, those same acts invite prosecution. To advise without license is to trespass upon the guild's proprietary domain. UPL statutes transform the republic into a theocracy of law, with the bar as high pontiff dispensing indulgences under the title *pro hac vice*. The Sixth Amendment's guarantee of "counsel of choice" is thus rendered contingent upon payment to a private intermediary.

These enactments eviscerate (Principle 2), which forbids any contrivance that abridges a right by artificial means. They also contravene the maxim of natural liberty, what God and reason permit, no legislature may forbid.

4.4 Violation of Foundational Rules Against Monopoly

Even within the human framework of law, monopolies are void. Coke, in *The Case of the Tailors of Ipswich* (11 Co. Rep. 53), held that such exclusives "assail liberty and trade" and are repugnant to the common law. He stated, "*the Common Law doth abhor all Monopolies, which forbid any one to work in any lawful Trade;*" modern jurisprudence concurs. In *Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar*, 421 U.S. 773 (1975), the Supreme Court struck down mandatory fee schedules as price-fixing under the Sherman Act, confirming that state bars enjoy no immunity from antitrust principles. The same reasoning applies with greater force to the act of licensing itself, which monopolizes not merely commerce but the means of justice.

By every metric, the bar fails the sovereign test of lawful monopoly:

1. No legislative charter was enacted by the people.
2. No public vote conferring consent.
3. No sunset clause ensuring accountability.
4. No competition permitting redress.

Each license fee is a toll upon liberty; each disbarment for "unauthorized practice" is a rigged expulsion from the market of justice. Tucker's edition of Blackstone's Commentaries condemned such conspiracies as treason against the commonwealth not as metaphor but as jurisprudential fact.

The people never licensed the licensers. The licensers simply appropriated the people's franchise, began collecting rent, and christened their seizure "reform."

In sum, the bar's licensing apparatus is a monument to inverted sovereignty a system in which servants have become masters, and a right secured by God and nature has been fenced, priced, and sold. It stands as proof that when an oath can be fractured and a license is sold; law itself becomes merchandise. The bar banned apprenticeship because a student who felt the oath break could not be controlled; a student who merely highlighted it could.

5.0 Governance by Financial Extortion, Where Rights Become Revenue

The modern bar's continued existence depends not upon law, but upon finance a machinery of extraction wherein justice itself is commodified. What the founders recognized as an unalienable right has been refashioned into a fee-based privilege. Through compulsory dues, unauthorized federal disbursements, and unconstitutional access tolls, the bar has constructed a fiscal apparatus of control, exemplifying Frédéric Bastiat's principle of "legal plunder":

"When the law is perverted to destroy that which it was meant to protect, it becomes the tool of every kind of greed."

This system does not sustain justice; it sustains itself. Its currency is obedience, its yield is silence, and its collateral is the people's right to redress. Firewall Principle 2.

5.1 Unappropriated and Unlawful Public Funding

The bar's economic foundation extends beyond private dues. It now feeds directly from unappropriated public funds, in flagrant violation of Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution, which commands:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law."

Neither Congress nor any state legislature has ever enacted a line-item appropriation authorizing public funds to be transferred to bar associations. Not only are these transfers unappropriated; they are affirmatively prohibited in forty-one state constitutions, which uniformly restrict public expenditure to the common good and forbid disbursement for the private interest of any one man, family, or class of men. The Massachusetts Constitution exemplifies this prohibition in dual form: Part the Second, Chapter II, Section I, Article XI declares that *"no money shall be issued out of the treasury of this commonwealth but by order of the governor pursuant to the resolve of the General Court for the necessary defense and support of the Commonwealth"*; and Part the First, Article VII establishes that *"government is instituted for the common good... not for the private interest of any one man, family, or class of men."* The bar satisfies neither criterion, it is neither a public defense nor a common benefit, but a private guild. Even if Congress or any state legislature had appropriated such funds, no constitutional authority exists to divert public treasure to a private syndicate. The transfer is void on both counts: unappropriated by statute and unauthorized by sovereign text.

Yet, federal databases reveal millions drawn annually under bureaucratic euphemisms such as “Rule of Law,” “Ethics Education,” and “Access to Justice.” These transfers are void ab initio under the Appropriations Clause, no delegation, no authority.

USASpending.gov confirms \$16 million in federal transfers to the American Bar Association between 2023 and 2025, including:

- \$5 million from USAID for “Rule of Law Initiatives.”
- \$6 million from the Department of Justice for “Ethics Training.”

State bars collectively access over \$100 million annually through indirect “pass-throughs,” including California’s \$95 million legal-aid allocation (2024), executed via non-transparent line items and subcontracting arrangements.

None of these transactions cite constitutional authority or statutory mandate. By operation of Principle 3 that government may secure rights, but never possess them, these transfers constitute misappropriation under color of law.

The 2025 Executive Order 14173, “Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity,” triggered partial funding freezes and ongoing audits of these disbursements. In May 2025, the Department of Justice halted a \$3.2 million transfer to the ABA’s DEI initiatives before partially relenting in July, citing “procedural irregularities.” These investigations expose a deeper systemic fraud, a private guild operating as a self-financed fourth branch of government, unbound by congressional oversight, yet sustained by the people’s treasury. Firewall Principle 4.

5.2 The Circular Payroll, Self-Taxation Without Delegation

The bar’s internal economy is equally illicit. It functions as a closed payroll loop, financed by compulsory dues that have no constitutional warrant. This structure violates Principle 4’s prohibition on redelegated taxation, only the people may authorize revenue collection, and only through express legislative delegation.

Yet, every attorney is compelled to pay:

- Massachusetts: \$300 annually, non-waivable.
- New York: \$2,500 active dues.
- California: \$485 base, \$295 late penalty.

Suspension for nonpayment, absent misconduct, has become the bar’s most common disciplinary act. Dues finance regulatory salaries, office facilities, disciplinary committees, and political advocacy all without appropriation, audit, or accountability. The guild taxes itself, polices itself, and pays itself, constituting the precise fiscal autarchy the Constitution forbids.

Disciplinary statistics reveal the inversion of purpose, misconduct may go unpunished, but missed dues guarantee immediate suspension. Revenue, not rectitude, is the bar’s primary measure of fidelity. Firewall Principle 2.

5.3 The Price of Admission, Unconstitutional Court Fees

The same economy of coercion governs the courts themselves. The public's right to justice declared free by every American charter is now conditioned upon payment. Filing fees, surcharges, and procedural tariffs impose a double exaction, taxing citizens once through general revenues and again through access tolls.

This contravenes the maxim recorded in Black's Law Dictionary, 2nd Edition, p. 679:

"Law does not suffer that the same thing be twice paid."

And it stands in direct violation of Massachusetts Constitution, Part I, Article XI, which guarantees:

"Every subject... ought to obtain right and justice freely, and without being obliged to purchase it."

The extent of this betrayal is quantifiable:

Emer de Vattel, in Law of Nations, Bk. I, Ch. III, § 30, defined such acts as "perfidious abuse of authority, a capital crime against society." To levy tolls upon justice is to weaponize governance against its own purpose.

State	Filing Fee (2025)	Constitutional Shield	Bar/Rule Citation	Vattel's Verdict
Massachusetts	\$815 (petition for admission: \$800 + \$15 surcharge)	Pt. I, Art. XI – Justice freely	Super. Ct. R. 2	<i>Pernicious abuse – subverts text</i>
New Hampshire	\$300 base + surcharges	Art. 14 – Justice without sale	Sup. Ct. R. 62-A (9/3/25)	<i>Perfidy – evasion of trust</i>
Minnesota	\$100 (motion); \$55 (writs)	Art. I § 8 – Justice administered freely	Gen. R. 800	<i>Void – no delegation</i>
Indiana	\$10/additional defendant	Art. I § 12 – Justice without sale	Ct. R. 80 (IC 33-37)	<i>Treason against society – attacks constitution</i>

Firewall Principle 2.

5.4 The Closed Fiscal Circuit

The bar's finances operate as a vertically integrated revenue system, a perpetual motion machine of plunder, perfected through mutual reinforcement:

1. Licensing fees sustain the administrative bureaucracy.

2. Continuing Legal Education (CLE) revenues indoctrinate and recondition the licensed, an annual re-oath to mutable precedent, never once citing Coke 110b.
3. Court filing fees monetize access to redress.
4. Federal grants subsidize the operation from above.

Each component depends on the other, the dues finance the training; the training reinforces compliance; the compliance ensures continued dues. The system is self-financing and self-protecting a fiscal organism masquerading as a profession.

There is no line-item appropriation, no external audit, and no citizen oversight. It possesses every attribute of government but none of its accountability. Its accounts balance not justice but liquidity, a privatized treasury behind a public façade. Firewall Principle 4.

5.5 The Economics of Surrender

The consequence of this financial structure is not efficiency, but institutional coercion. The modern justice system rewards surrender and punishes assertion. A trial once the forum of reason and conscience has been replaced by a marketplace of expedience.

- 98% of criminal defendants now plead guilty pre-trial, eliminating the expense of juries.
- Each avoided jury trial saves approximately \$30,000 in judicial salary, staff wages, and overhead.
- Each confession becomes a fiscal dividend a “win” for efficiency and a loss for liberty.

Legal education reinforces this calculus, three years devoted to how to file motions under Rule 12(b)(6), and none on why the Sixth Amendment forbids suppression of confrontation. The bar calls this modernization; in truth, it is monetized capitulation justice priced and prepackaged for convenience. Firewall Principle 7.

5.6 The Moral and Constitutional Balance Sheet

This economy of extortion is the natural outcome of illegitimate delegation. Licensing was never authorized; therefore, every cent collected under its color is an unlawful taking. Each dollar drawn from unappropriated funds, each fee demanded for redress, each CLE tithe demanded for compliance collectively convert constitutional government into corporate dominion.

The bar calls it standards; the citizen recognizes tollbooths.

They call it continuing education; the practitioner endures annual ransom.

They call it filing fees; the people pay an entry tax upon their own rights.

The ledgers balance not liberty, but profit. The books never lie; the only interest the bar protects is the cut. Firewall Principle 3.

6.0 Reckoning and Reclaim

What precedes is a methodical autopsy of a legal order corrupted from within—not a call to revolution, but to resurrection.

The People of these United States never surrendered the keys of their sovereignty. They never delegated the licensing of conscience to private guilds, never franchised the public oath into a professional commodity, never bartered birthright for convenience. Yet over time, the apprenticeship of reason was supplanted by the credential of permission; juries yielded to judges; and education, once a moral discipline, became an industrial process of compliance.

No statute, code, or rule may invert the hierarchy of law that the common-law tradition universally recognized,

Nature's God above; Constitution beneath; every rule, every fee, every procedural code subordinate.

This hierarchy is not conjectural; it is the settled foundation of Anglo-American jurisprudence.

- Sir Edward Coke, *The Second Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England* (1642) 67 a: “Propositions to be of all men confessed and granted without proof, argument, or discourse... they are the law of the land.”
- William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1765–69) 1 Comm. 41: “This law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other.”
- Thomas Cooley, *Constitutional Limitations* (1868) pp. 40–41: “No enactment can rise above the Constitution; but the Constitution itself must bow to the higher law.”
- John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* §240: “The people shall be judge whether their rulers act contrary to the trust reposed in them.”
- Emer de Vattel, *Law of Nations* (1758) Bk. II, §12: “Perfidy toward lawful authority is a crime of the highest order.”
- St. George Tucker, *Blackstone's Commentaries with Notes of Reference to the Constitution and Laws of the United States* (1803) App. 300: “A monopoly in law is treason against the commonwealth.”

Each of these authorities articulates the same maxim: law is not the will of men, but the reason of God applied to men.

6.1 The Ledger of Violations

Measured against these immutable standards, the modern barocracy fails every test. Violation by violation, its record exposes systemic betrayal:

1. Delegation — Void. No clause in any federal or state constitution delegates to a private guild the power to license advocacy or define “practice.” *Delegata potestas non potest delegari* (2 Inst. 597).
2. Oaths — Fractured. Dual allegiance to Constitution and Bar divides fidelity; one cannot serve two masters.
3. Conflicts — Codified. Rules of professional conduct substitute guild ethics for constitutional duty.
4. Unauthorized-Practice Statutes — Weaponized. Natural right of petition and defense criminalized, contra Mass. Const. pt. 1, art. XI.
5. Courts — Self-policing. Judges adjudicate disputes arising from their own guild’s rules, violating *nemo iudex in causa sua*.
6. Federal Funds — Laundered. Bar associations receive unappropriated transfers in violation of U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 7 (*Cincinnati v. United States*, 1883).
7. Juries — Suppressed. Waiver obtained without informed consent, contravening *Magna Carta* ch. 39 and Mass. Const. art. XII.
8. Pleas — Extracted. Expedience replaces justice, the ledger values efficiency over verity.
9. *Pro se* Voices — Silenced. Citizens assisting one another are fined for “unauthorized practice,” despite the First Amendment guarantee to petition for redress.

All these acts are **without delegation** and **under color of law**.

The edifice collapses the instant one lawful grand jury asks the only question that matters: **“Did you swear the same oath we did?”**

When that question is put, the record will show:

- Hearsay admitted without confrontation;
- Juries waived without vote;
- Exculpatory evidence buried under “zealous” representation;
- Contempt fines imposed for unlicensed aid;
- Pleas sold to clear the docket;
- Judges citing ABA model rules as superior to constitutional text;
- Federal grants funneled to bar treasuries, no line-item appropriation, no oversight.

Due process does not die by repeal; it dies by routine.
Justice is not delayed; it is priced.

6.2 Verdict

The conclusion is inescapable:

The organized bar is an unauthorized syndicate, unconstitutional at inception, perjurious in oath, monopolistic in trade, and extortionate in finance. Its licenses are null ab initio (*Norton v. Shelby County*, 118 U.S. 425 (1886)). Its courts are tribunals of the guild, not of the People. Its revenues constitute plunder, not lawful appropriation.

To every officer still bearing a bar card: the era of plausible deniability has expired. You cannot sit upon that bench without recusal, for you are a party in interest. You cannot negotiate that plea without confessing participation in an unconstitutional monopoly. You cannot file that Rule 12(b)(6) motion without conceding that the Firewall of Due Process stands intact and supreme.

6.3 Restoration, Not Revolt

This is not insurrection; it is restoration. The People call for no new architecture, only the re-animation of the one already written in the blood and reason of their forebears.

Recuse where conflict demands. Return the oath to its singular object. Stand once more as minister of justice, not agent of a guild.

The Republic does not request; it reminds. The Firewall endures, immutable, inviolable, awaiting only remembrance.

6.4 Lawful Command

“When the People in due form give notice, it standeth in law as if the King himself commanded.”
— Sir Edward Coke, *Institutes of the Laws of England*, Book III, Ch. V.

Shacken’s Maxim 120: *“One lawfully commanding must be obeyed.”*

Therefore, a lawful notice issued by the People is not petition but command. It invokes the original sovereign authority from which all offices derive.

To every individual still holding a bar credential, there remains no plausible deniability. What you do under color of that license is unlawful. You must recuse, for the oath you took, to uphold the Constitution, is the only one that counts. All else is guild fiction.

Return the card. Or answer to the People who have now given lawful command.